

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 have been rejected. Claim 7 has been canceled. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated August 1, 2006 are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As disclosed in the specification, the mesh is a layer of material that is sprayed on only the etching area of the door mold (S310). Specification at 5, lines 21-23 (here, "predetermined" refers to the predetermined area onto which the mesh is sprayed, *i.e.*, the "entire etching area," not the previously masked and protected non-etching area.). As it is "sprayed," the mesh is a liquid material.

Subsequent etching of the door mold (S320) with chemicals "selected in accordance with the mold material and the mesh" will, together with the mesh, cause to be produced a natural "texture of wood on the door." Id. at 5, lines 24, 27-28. Thus, in contrast to the pattern forming process (S200) which creates a realistic wood grain *pattern* on the door mold, the mesh forming process (S300) creates the *texture* of real wood upon the surface of the door mold. See also id. at 6, lines 2-15.

The mesh is transferred, *i.e.*, sprayed, onto the door mold (S310), in *only* the etching area, as is the subsequent etching step (S320), due to the previous pattern forming process (S200) in which the non-etching area of the door mold was "precisely masked" (S230). Id. at 4, line 14. As such, the etching area was "carefully divided" from the non-etching area, and the non-etching area was "fully protected" during the etching step (S240). Id., lines 14-16. This division, or masking, remains in place during all steps of the mesh forming process (S300), until the mask removal/inspection process (S500).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-6 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph,

as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential steps, elements and structural relationships between elements, such omission amounting to a gap between method and steps. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

First, Applicant respectfully points out that the essential steps of the mesh transfer step (S310) have been adequately described in the specification. See *supra* (remarks traversing the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph).

Second, Applicant respectfully suggests that the word "mesh" need not be interpreted as an art recognized term. In other words, a special definition need not be imputed to the word "mesh" in order for the specification to be sufficiently definite under § 112, second paragraph. The ordinary meaning of the word "mesh" contemplates the disclosed layer of liquid material scattered by spraying upon the door mold. Applicant posits that, despite the allegedly indefinite use of the word "mesh," those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the mesh transfer step (S310) for what it is—a simple liquid spraying step, similar to the application of spray paint—rather than a step requiring special skill or understanding in the art to appreciate.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the specification and claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4307.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP


Amy Sun
Registration No. 53,653

Date: January 2, 2007.

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300